SR 9 / 32nd St SE 84th St NE - Safety Improvements Project
RFP Questions and Answers # 3 - January 15, 2014

KEY: Closed New/Updated

Question	RFP Reference	Question	Date Received	Response
1		At location A, the existing utility base mapping shows an existing waterline running on the southside of 32nd Street SE outside the roadway. The waterline alignment is shown running from valve box/meter to valve box/meter, but several potholes in the roadway indicate the waterline in further to the west lying in the roadway. Please confirm the correct location of the waterline.	12/11/2013	Revised plan and .dgn file will be provided in a future addendum.
2		The pot holes for the waterline show a buried depth of 41.5” below grade, will the Design-builder be required to retro fit the pipe to the proper cover depth (greater than 5’) within the limits of the project?	12/11/2013	Retrofitting to the proper cover would only be required if there is a conflict and the Utility must be Relocated.
3		We have reviewed the RFP design documentation packages for both Location A & B, and have not found the “Pedestrian/Area Classification” required to identify the correct amount of lighting. Please provide the Pedestrian/ Area classification for both locations.	12/11/2013	It is the Design-Builder's responsibility to review the pedestrian usage and determine the classification according to the Mandatory Standards.

Question	RFP Reference	Question	Date Received	Response
4		Will WSDOT consider an ATC for another friction treatment for the Polymer prescribed application for location A. If no, will WSDOT provide the current projects that this product has been used and the current list of WSDOT approved certified contractors to apply the treatment.	12/19/2013	WSDOT will consider ATC's that modify the Contract to provide a Project that is "equal or better". WSDOT does not maintain a list of approved certified contractors that apply HFS. In Washington, HFS has been used in the following locations: • SR 14 Test Installation (SE 164th Ave Southbound to SR 14 Westbound ramp) • Forest Drive intersection with Coal Creek Parkway in Bellevue • SE 20th Street in the City of Sammamish
5		Will open trench construction be allowed across the SR 9 roadway for the new drainage conveyance for location A and B? It will be challenging and costly if the DB is expected to use alternative methods to open cuts (boring, jacking, etc.) to install with the limited potholing and unknowns of the underground utilities. We would propose an open cut section using CDF and HMA which would address settlement and long term maintenance issues.	12/19/2013	See Addendum No.4
6		Section 2.14.1, (p. 2.14-1, lines 11-12): Please clarify where in the Highway Runoff Manual the requirements (pursuant to design) of the TESC Report are defined.	1/8/2014	See Addendum No.4
7		Has Maintenance reviewed these ponds and confirmed that they meet the requirements of Section 2.14.4.8? If not could it is requested that they provide input on where they see any shortcomings to the conceptual design.	1/8/2014	Yes, maintenance has reviewed the Conceptual plans and feels comfortable with the maintainability of the concept. See Addendum No. 4.

Question	RFP Reference	Question	Date Received	Response
8		Has Maintenance reviewed the design adjacent to the MFD at Location B with the narrow shoulder behind the curb and confirmed that it meets the requirements of Section 2.14.4.8?	1/8/2014	Yes, maintenance has reviewed the Conceptual plans and feels comfortable with the maintainability of the concept. See Addendum No. 4.
9		Section 2.14.5.4, (p. 2.14-13, lines 8-12): The requirement for drainage of pavements for temporary traffic shifts is more conservative than for permanent design which allows for runoff to extend 2 feet into the travel lane at the location of a sag. As written this would not be allowed. Furthermore, the cross streets have a posted speed less than 45 mph which would allow the spread to extend 2 feet beyond the shoulder for the permanent condition. Please confirm the requirements. Is the intent that this standard apply to all traffic shifts regardless of duration and time of year that it would occur.	1/8/2014	See Addendum No.4.
10		The flow control ponds appear to apply the approach of the "Off-site inflow area option" as defined on (Page 4-22 of Chapter 4 of the HRM). Is the pond area included as part of the "on-site mitigated area"? The Conceptual Plan indicates that the NW Pond at Location B, includes a Q100 from offsite contribution that is exactly 50% of the Q100 for the on-site area. The HRM requires that it be less than 50%. This leaves little room for refinement unless pond areas are also considered mitigated areas. Please clarify interpretation of that section of the HRM.	1/8/2014	The HRM is a Contract requirement and Project design must be developed in accordance with the HRM. In the concept, the pond area is not included in the "on-site mitigated area". Consistent with the HRM, the pond area is included in sizing calculations. Yes, the HRM requires that the Q100 from offsite contribution is less than 50% of the Q100 for the on-site area.
11		Addendum 3 has identified buried fiber beneath the north leg of the intersection that appears to be in conflict with elements of the Conceptual Plan. Will this fiber be required to remain in place?	1/8/2014	See Addendum No.4

Question	RFP Reference	Question	Date Received	Response
12		"On other WSDOT design build jobs there has been specific language in chapter 2.14 regarding open cut installation of storm sewer across existing traffic lanes. Usually this is located in 2.14.4.2 Collection and Conveyance Structures and reads, "Conveyance systems shall not be constructed by open cut across existing traffic lanes". This language was removed from the SR9 2.14.4.2 technical requirements and no other reference in 2.14. I do not believe that the referenced sections from Q&A number 5 (2.16.4.2.5 and 2.22.4.3.1) dis-allow the open cut installation of storm sewer pipe. Please clarify."	1/8/2014	See Addendum No.4
13		RFP Section 2.17.4.9 specifies that pedestrian push buttons be located behind sidewalk, which precludes use of perpendicular curb ramps due to the distance from curb to back of sidewalk. The dual parallel curb ramps as shown on the NW and NE corners in Appendix M1 conceptual plans do not have sufficient distance between them to install two standard parallel ramps per WSDOT Std Plan F-40.12-02. In order to install two standard parallel ramps, each would have to be moved farther back around the curb return, which may have safety and/or operational impacts. Would WSDOT consider revising push button locating requirements to allow for dual perpendicular curb ramps?	1/7/2014	See Addendum No.4

Question	RFP Reference	Question	Date Received	Response
14		We would like to confirm the required distance for illumination at the roundabout is 400' for all legs, as indicated in Exhibit 1040-12 of the WSDOT Design Manual or if the side streets require less illumination.	1/6/2014	WSDOT only requires illumination on the side street to the edge of WSDOT R/W or limited access. However, the DB is required to supply illumination on the side street approaches (beyond the WSDOT R/W or limited access) according to Local Agency requirements. If the Local Agency does require lighting in this part of the roundabout approach, then that portion would be separate from the WSDOT lighting system, designed to Local Agency standards and would be owned/operated/maintained by that Local Agency.